Highlights

• Round 1 of the FSMS in Kassala was carried out at the peak of the lean season.
• The food security situation in the urban and rural areas in Kassala is very good. However, the food security situation in the refugee camps are much worse and as many as 64 percent are food insecure among the assessed refugees.
• The minimum healthy food basket costs 1.52 SDG/person/day and 32 percent of the refugees cannot afford this basket.
• The overall food consumption situation is good in Kassala with 99 percent of the households in the urban areas having an acceptable food consumption. The refugees are again worse off with 28 percent having a borderline or poor food consumption.
• As many as 92 percent of the households in the refugee camps have to engage in various coping strategies compared to 60 and 71 percent of the households in urban and rural areas.
• In the refugee camps, 25 percent of the women had a low MUAC.

Food Security Situation

The food security situation in urban and rural areas in Kassala state is very good. In the urban areas, 100 percent of the households are food secure while 89 percent of the in the rural households are food secure and 11 percent are moderately food insecure. No households in the urban or rural areas of the state are severely food insecure.

The situation is worse in the refugee camps, where only 36 percent of the households are food secure and as many as 64 percent are moderately or severely food insecure.

When analysing the food security situation by location, most of the locations are food secure. The exceptions are the two locations of Amadam and Zalak that are moderately food insecure, as well as the two refugee camps, Aboda and Shagarab, situated at the lowest threshold (severe).
During June 2010, local sorghum was the main type of cereal traded in the Kassala market followed by wheat. Although Kassala State is one of the sorghum-deficit regions in Sudan, the relatively high supply of sorghum in this market seems to be derived by an additional demand created by the informal trade between Kassala and the neighboring countries. This is especially true if the volume of sorghum traded in the Kassala market is compared to that of sorghum-surplus region Sennar. In fact, the quantity of the current stocks on traders hands and the rate of stock turnover seem to support the presence of an informal cross border trade. Moreover, the main constraints that affect the marketing of cereal in this market are directly related to cross-border trade. According to interviewed traders, lack of enough storage facilities and security barriers against informal cross-border trade are the main constraints affecting the grain market in Kassala.

Sorghum prices in Kassala in 2010 are higher than the prices last year and much higher than the average from the previous 3 years. However, there was a decline in the cereal prices from January to March for two reasons. Firstly, general food distribution was carried out in the refugee camps in January, and a high proportion of this food was sold in the market. Secondly, the government did strict controls of the cross border trade, which again meant that huge cereal supplies were confined to the state.

The price reductions for sorghum in the period between January to March has led to an improvement in the terms of trade (one goat for one bag of sorghum) in the favor of animal herders, while the rest of the year 2010 witnessed an improved term of trade for the farmers due to the increased sorghum prices.

Agriculture

Agriculture is the main economic activity in Kassala state and there are 4 systems of agriculture in the state: rain fed, flood irrigation, horticulture and surface irrigation. Due to the increase in cereal prices this year, increased rainfall levels and high levels of water in the river Gash, it is expected that the cultivated area this season will increase substantially. Average area cultivated per household is 8 feddan in urban areas, 17 feddan in rural areas and 16 feddan for refugees. Furthermore, as many as 82 percent of the rural households are expected to cultivate this season.

Proportion of farmers who cultivated this season

\[
\begin{array}{cccc}
\text{Cultivated this season} & \text{Not cultivated} & \text{Cultivated this season} & \text{Not cultivated} \\
\text{Urban} & \text{this season} & \text{Rural} & \text{this season} \\
26\% & 74\% & 35\% & 65\% \\
\end{array}
\]
**Income Sources**

The most important contributor to income for the households in urban areas are small business (26 percent), followed by salaried work (20 percent) and wage labour (17 percent).

In rural areas, wage labour is the most important income source (24 percent), followed by sale of cereals (17 percent) and small business and firewood collection/charcoal making (both 13 percent). As this is only the beginning of the agricultural season, it is expected that sale of cereals will be the main income source in the coming harvest season.

When looking at income sources in the refugee camps, wage labor is the main income source (36 percent), followed by other income sources (22 percent) and sale of cereals (9 percent).

**Expenditure (income proxy)**

Among the sampled households, an average of 39 percent of monthly expenditures is allocated to the purchase of food items. This is regarded as very low and therefore good since household have a greater margin and thus are not immediately affected by price increases as when a household uses more than 65 percent of their income on food.

The main non-food expenditure is construction (10 percent). This is mainly due to the beginning of the rainy season when households usually do extra maintenance on their houses to prepare for the coming season. Additionally, households spend an average 7 percent of health care and 6 percent on education as this is the beginning of the school year.

The cost of the minimum healthy food basket in Kassala is 1.52 SDG/person/day. The overall purchasing power situation in Kassala is good, with as many a 89 percent of the households in the urban areas and 81 percent in the rural areas affording more than 2 minimum healthy food baskets. However, in the refugee camps only 26 percent can afford two baskets, and as many as 32 percent cannot even afford one minimum healthy food basket.

When looking at the income proxy by location, all the locations in Kassala are above the upper threshold, with the exception of the two refugee camps, Aboda and Shgarab situated close to the lower threshold (severe).
Food Consumption and Sources

In Kassala state, the overall food consumption situation is good. In the urban areas some 99 percent of the households have an acceptable food consumption and only 1 percent have a borderline food consumption. In the rural areas, 96 percent of the households have an acceptable food consumption while only 4 percent have a borderline consumption. None of the households in the urban and rural areas have a poor food consumption.

The situation is worse among the assessed refugee camps where 23 percent of the households have a borderline food consumption and 5 percent have a poor food consumption.

Furthermore, when analysing the food consumption score by location, all the locations are above the upper threshold. When comparing the scores among the locations, the two refugee camps are again worst off, however they average score is still above the acceptable score.

Coping Strategy Index

When households were asked if they faced any food shortages the last month, 60% of the households in urban areas and 71 percent of the households in the rural areas responded that they had faced shortages and had engaged in coping strategies.

For the households in the refugee camps, as many as 92 percent had to engage in different coping strategies. Out of this, as many as 46 percent used medium risk coping strategies while 14 percent used high risk strategies.
Mid Upper Arm Circumference (MUAC)

Mid Upper Arm Circumference (MUAC) was measured on 505 women in the age of 18 to 45 in Kassala state.

Only 7 percent of the women in urban areas have a low MUAC less than 225 mm (Sudan MoH threshold).

In rural areas, 19 percent have a MUAC less than 225 mm and in the refugee camps the percentage is 25 percent.

Population movement

Kassala state has a daily influx of new arrivals mainly from Eritrea, but also from Ethiopia and Somalia. The majority of the refugees use Sudan as a transit country on their way to Europe and Australia. There are 12 refugee camps in Kassala state and 56 00 refugees. Of them, 51 percent of the most vulnerable refugees receive assistance from WFP, in addition to their host communities. Since 2002, there has been an increase of IDPs in Kassala state. At present, there is no population movement. However, population movement in the state is more a seasonal phenomenon, due to floods and other seasonal factors.

For further information, please contact Abdelsalam Hassan (salimosly@hotmail.com): STRATEGIC RESERVE CORPORATION or Yvonne Forsen (yvonne.forsen@wfp.org) UNITED NATIONS WORLD FOOD PROGRAMME—SUDAN
# Annex 1 – Profile of Sentinel sites

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State Name</th>
<th>Location Name</th>
<th>Community Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kassala</td>
<td>Aboda</td>
<td>Refugees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Amadam</td>
<td>Rural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Awad</td>
<td>Rural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Halfa</td>
<td>Urban</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hindia</td>
<td>Rural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kassala</td>
<td>Urban</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Makli</td>
<td>Rural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Shgarab</td>
<td>Refugees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tahday</td>
<td>Rural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Village 26</td>
<td>Rural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wad El Helew</td>
<td>Rural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wagar</td>
<td>Rural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wahd Arab</td>
<td>Rural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Zalak</td>
<td>Rural</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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